
OVERALL QUALITY RATING: GOOD.

Summary: The report is comprehensive, logically structured and responds to the requirements outlined in the ToR. The report does, however, contain numerous grammatical and spelling errors which undermine the report’s clarity. The executive summary gives a good overview of the main results of the evaluation. The design and methodology explains the objectives of the report, and limitations are addressed by triangulation of mixed-methods data collection. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified and supported by the annexes. Findings stem from rigorous data analysis and are substantiated by evidence. Conclusions are organized around program components (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) and highlight key successes and gaps of the program. Recommendations cover difference aspects of the program, they are strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible. The conclusions and recommendations are well-written and logically flow from results and have an implicit priority order.

### Quality Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.**

Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:

- i) Acronyms; ii) Exec Summary; iii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned (where applicable)

- Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.

**Poor**

The report is logically structured and drafted in accordance with UNFPA requirements. The individual sections are well-structured, facilitated by the use of bolded summary sentences for key paragraphs. The report’s tables and figures are clear and neatly presented. Moreover, the report includes side-boxes with useful information such as ‘Evaluation Questions’ to help guide the reader. Side-boxes also included beneficiary testimony, which was a useful guide for readers. Annexes include all requirements.

However, headings and subheadings are not numbered which impairs the report’s readability. Furthermore, acronyms are not systematically written in full when used for the first time and, there are numerous grammatical and spelling errors that undermine the report’s clarity.

The ‘Country Background’ section does not adequately reference sources in some of the data presented, particularly in the sub-section on ‘Gender’ (p.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Executive Summary

To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.

Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):

- i) Purpose, including intended audience(s);
- ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para);
- iii) Methodology (1 para);
- iv) Main Conclusions (1 para);
- v) Recommendations (1 para).

Maximum length 3-4 page.

Good
The executive summary provides a clear and concise description of the objectives and scope of the evaluation, the methodology used, and the main conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary also provides an overview of the country context that serves a useful background to the intervention. Moreover, the length of the executive summary is four pages, which is equal to the specified maximum length.

3. Design and Methodology

To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools

Minimum content and sequence:

- Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;
- Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;
- Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;
- Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided;
- Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.

Good
The Methodology section is located in “Chapter 2: Purpose and Objectives of the CP Evaluation.” This section provides an overview of evaluation methodology with related supportive tables (Table 5: CP Site Sampling) and annexes (the list of key informants is provided in Annex 3 and the Evaluation Framework in Annex 4.1). All major questions were addressed.

Explanation of methodological choice is given in the text. For instance, the evaluation consultants used an appreciative enquiry approach “in order to strengthen understanding of why something worked well, and how success might be replicated.” Forced field analysis was used "to analyze the forces working for and against a policy, strategic direction and/or its realization.” The evaluators created and used a results matrix. Constraints and limitations are explained. These included a loss of documents due to a bombing of facilities, over-ambitious results framework (outputs), inadequate identification of indicators (output and outcome), limited available of monitoring data, and poor reporting quality. Efforts made to overcome constraints within the evaluation design include field visit efforts to identify beneficiaries, extensive stakeholder consultations, and further document review in order to triangulate data sources.

Techniques and Tools for data collection are provided in a clear and concise manner.
The desk review, semi-structured interviews, appreciative inquiry, forced field analysis, focus group discussions, press analysis and triangulation of findings are described in detail. The phases of the evaluation are also clearly defined. Sampling methods for determining where to have field visits were sound.

Details of participatory stakeholders’ consultation process are provided with a Stakeholder Mapping matrix given in Annex 2. It is said that “The preliminary findings and recommendations were presented to the National CP Governing Board and UNFPA.”

The report details how cross-cutting issues impact upon the evaluation methodology in a section on the 'Relevance' of the evaluation. This section details how programme components were aligned with national/international agenda and frameworks, and how the programme was gender sensitive and employed human rights-based approaches. The report also discusses ethical issues guiding the evaluation.

4. Reliability of Data

To clarify data collection processes and data quality

- Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;
- Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit;
- Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.

Good

Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified and clearly explained in Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed, Annex 2: Stakeholder Mapping, Annex 3: List of People Met, and Annex 4: Proposed Evaluation Tools. Nevertheless, the following annexes do not include contact information. Name of the department, web-site, phone number or e-mail would be useful to ensure reliability of data.

Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit in the Methodology and Evaluation limitations sections of Chapter 2.

Thus, the evaluators clarify their sources of information “Documents: Program related documents...Quantitative Analysis: The team utilized quantitative analysis to examine changes in selected but comparable indicators from available data, Press Publications: The team analysed 100% of press publication from the set provided by UNFPA.” The report specifies that the sampling methodology for site selection employed was purposive rather than random, but the report made clear that efforts were made to ensure that the selection of locations took into account geographic location, levels of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI and PI, and between UN-supported/UNFPA-supported states. The sites that were subsequently selected for data collection are specified in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregated data by gender have been utilized when necessary. The report presents ample mention of gender with regards to the programme objective of incorporating gender sensitivity approaches in to programming. Data in the report is presented disaggregated by gender where necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Findings and Analysis

To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

**Findings**

- Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;
- Findings are substantiated by evidence;
- Findings are presented in a clear manner

**Analysis**

- Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;
- Contextual factors are identified.
- Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.

**Good**

Findings stem from rigorous qualitative data analysis appropriate to the data collection methods employed. Findings are substantiated by evidence and are presented in a clear manner. Results of output achievement are broken down by programme components. Figures and tables are included and well-positioned so as to complement the text.

The theoretical links between the intervention (activities and outputs) and end results (intended outcomes) are explained. The analysis correctly focused on what are termed "outputs" in the CP, although these are really direct outcomes. Importantly, the analysis shows the connection between what UNFPA provides (the real outputs) and what has happened in terms of the outputs shown in the CP. The authors also discuss the alignment of specific outputs to the UNFPA Strategic Plan outcomes in the Corporate Strategic Alignment sub-section. Unintended results, or unexpected outcomes, are also highlighted where evident.

The section on effectiveness is particularly sound. Interpretations are based on carefully stated assumptions and external contextual factors are identified and explained. Challenges are analyzed with regards to the program components: reproductive health, youth development, and gender. Inadequate synergies between components were explained as a result of poor participatory planning practices at the sub-national level.

6. Conclusions

To assess the validity of conclusions

**Good**

Conclusions are presented in a separate chapter and are organized around program
### Quality Assessment criteria

- Conclusions are based on credible findings;
- Conclusions are organized in priority order;
- Conclusions must convey evaluators’ unbiased judgment of the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Conclusions are based on credible findings taking into account through desk review and triangulation of primary data. The conclusions are based on the findings and as such can be considered unbiased.
- Conclusions are not organized in priority order; rather, conclusions are ordered by the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Concluding comments are also included in a section entitled 'Lessons Learned' and these are organized by program components.

### 7. Recommendations

**To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations**

- Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;
- Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible;
- Recommendations must take into account stakeholders’ consultations whilst remaining impartial;
- Recommendations should be presented in priority order

**Good**

- Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions. Recommendations are strategic, targeted and limited in scope in such a way as to make them operationally feasible. The report suggests that stakeholder consultations be included within the implementation of recommendations and provides example.
- Recommendations are numbered and include activities and objectives which may be accomplished by these activities. The, recommendations are strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible. They are organized in a priority order.
- Recommendations took into account stakeholders’ consultations as noted in the methodology section which states that “The preliminary findings and recommendations were presented to the National CP Governing Board and UNFPA. Their comments have been addressed in this final report.”

### 8. Meeting Needs

To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the report). In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.

**Good**

- The evaluation report responds to the evaluation questions and criteria outlined in the TOR. The evaluation report is also consistent with the scope specified in the TOR, and the TOR is annexed in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)</th>
<th>Assessment Levels (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Findings and analysis (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclusions (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recommendations (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting needs (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. if “Finding and Analysis” has been assessed as “good”, please enter the number 50 into the “Good” column. The Assessment level scoring the higher number of points will determine the overall quality of the Report.

**OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Good.**